

1 Teresa M. Corbin (SBN 132360)  
 Denise M. De Mory (SBN 168076)  
 2 Ethan B. Andelman (SBN 209101)  
 Jaclyn C. Fink (SBN 217913)  
 3 HOWREY LLP  
 525 Market Street, Suite 3600  
 4 San Francisco, California 94105  
 Telephone: (415) 848-4900  
 5 Facsimile: (415) 848-4999

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff SYNOPSIS, INC.  
 and for Defendants AEROFLEX INCORPORATED,  
 7 AMI SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX  
 ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS, LTD., MATROX  
 8 GRAPHICS, INC., MATROX INTERNATIONAL  
 CORP., MATROX TECH, INC., and  
 9 AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
 13

14 RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, AMI  
 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX  
 18 ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS LTD., MATROX  
 GRAPHICS INC., MATROX  
 19 INTERNATIONAL CORP., MATROX TECH,  
 INC., AND AEROFLEX COLORADO  
 20 SPRINGS, INC.

21 Defendants.

22 SYNOPSIS, INC.,

23 Plaintiff,

24 vs.

25 RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

26 Defendant.

Case No. C03-04669 MJJ (EMC)

Case No. C03-02289 MJJ (EMC)

**RESPONSE TO RIOCH'S STATUS  
 REPORT**

Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen

1 Ricoh's Status Report filed on August 29, 2006 addresses two issues that the parties have not  
 2 met and conferred on. Furthermore, Ricoh's proposed order only addresses the language of the  
 3 document requests, not the language of the subpoenas.

4 First, Ricoh raises the specter that "[e]very textbook that mentioned a computer circuit, or any  
 5 paper or manual the referenced the design or operation of a computer, could be swept into defendants'  
 6 indiscriminating definition." (Status Report at 1:23-25.) This is an issue Ricoh did not raise at the  
 7 meet and confer (nor did Defendants understand this to be a concern of the Court in its August 24  
 8 Order). In any event, this issue is wholly overblown — the requests and subpoenas are limited to  
 9 documents created by or for Dr. Papaefthymiou for teaching purposes or invention disclosure, and do  
 10 not seek documents such as general textbooks, papers, or manuals written by others. Should the Court  
 11 wish to explicitly carve out such documents, Defendants have no objection to that being done.

12 Second, Ricoh asks this Court to "preserve the right of the Universities to submit their own  
 13 objections to the subpoenas." Again, this is not an issue that was raised at the meet and confer.  
 14 Defendants respectfully suggest that this Court cannot issue an order that does what Ricoh requests.  
 15 The return date on the subpoenas was August 18. As this Court has previously noted, it lacks  
 16 jurisdiction directly over the subpoenas, which issued from other Districts. (See Order Denying  
 17 Motion To Quash.) Thus, this Court cannot change the date by which objections were due pursuant to  
 18 Rule 45 — it can only limit Defendants' ability to enforce the subpoenas.<sup>1</sup> (*See, e.g.*, 8/18 Order at 2:3  
 19 ("the Court hereby stays **enforcement** of the subpoenas for 7 days.") (emphasis added).)  
 20

21 Dated: August 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

22 HOWREY, LLP

23  
 24 By: /s/ Ethan B. Andelman  
 25 Ethan B. Andelman (SBN 209101)  
 26 Attorneys for Plaintiff SYNOPSIS, INC., *et al.*

27 <sup>1</sup> Notably, only Defendants' proposed order is worded in this fashion; furthermore, it directly addresses the subpoenas, not  
 28 just the document requests (as Ricoh's proposed order is fashioned).